



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,952	01/29/2002	Akio Nakayama	218433US2	3574
22850	7590	09/17/2004		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
			EXAMINER	
			DI GRAZIO, JEANNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 09/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/057,952

Applicant(s)

NAKAYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Jeanne A. Di Grazio

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Election of 21 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11, 12 and 14-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-7, 14, 15 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7142004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims

Claims 10 and 13 have been cancelled per Amendment of March 8, 2004.

Priority

Priority to Japanese Patent Applications 2001-028982 (Feb. 6, 2001) and 2001-229099 (July 30, 2001) is claimed.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Species A, Figure 1, claims 1-3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 readable thereon in the reply filed on June 21, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "the PTO has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish that searching and examining the claims corresponding to the noted figures would be an undue burden."

(Provisional Election of Species at page 1) This is not found persuasive because the Examiner required an election of seven patentably distinct *species* of the claimed invention as opposed to *groups* of inventions. Furthermore, it is respectfully pointed out that Applicant has not traversed on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

Claim Objections

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claim 8, the reference to a “central portion” is not clear. The central portion may refer to the second pixel electrode or it may refer to a central portion of a plurality of the other claimed elements. For examination purposes, the Examiner interprets the “central portion” in light of the current prior art of record.

Appropriate correction is **required**.

Drawings

Figures 18 and 19 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2871

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 9, 11, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,680,190 (to Michibayashi et al.) in view of United States Patent 5,777,700 (to Kaneko et al.).

As to claims 1 and 9, Michibayashi teaches and discloses a liquid crystal display apparatus including the same transparent material in the TFT semiconductor layer and a sub-pixel electrode and has the following structure: transistors disposed at the intersections of gate lines and source lines (Figure 1B, gate electrode 13 and source electrode 15a and TFT 25), pixel electrodes connected with the (drain electrodes of the) transistors (Figure 1A, pixel electrode 23, Col. 4, Lines 65-67, Col. 5, Lines 35-37), opposite electrodes opposite to these pixel electrodes (Figure 1A, counter electrode 24, Col. 4, Lines 62-64), and liquid crystal held between said opposite electrode and said pixel electrodes (Figure 1A, liquid crystal 21, Col. 4., Lines 60-63), wherein said pixel electrodes comprise a first pixel electrode and a second pixel electrode disposed in a layer above an insulating film which is itself disposed in a layer above the first pixel electrode, and having a region that does not overlap with the first pixel electrode (Figure

Art Unit: 2871

1A: first sub-pixel electrode 23a and second sub-pixel electrode 23b, insulating film 14), and wherein the first pixel electrode and second pixel electrode are electrically connected (with said drain electrode) (Col. 2, Lines 65-67 and Col. 3, Lines 1 and 2, Col. 5, Lines 35-37)(Figure 9, sub-pixel 42an, contact hole 48, and sub-pixel 42bm), and the first pixel electrode applying a first electric field to the liquid crystal, and the second pixel electrode applying a second electric field whose strength is different from the first electric field to the liquid crystal (Col. 6, Lines 26-40).

Michibayashi does not appear to explicitly specify that a ratio of a first voltage applied to the first pixel electrode and a second voltage applied to the second pixel electrode is 0.5:1.0 to 0.9:1.0.

Kaneko teaches and discloses a liquid crystal display with improved viewing angle dependence (Title, Abstract, entire patent). With reference to Figure 42B, Kaneko illustrates first pixel electrode (94) and second pixel electrode (96) separated by a gate insulation film (98). The gate insulation film has a thickness of 4,000 Angstroms ($=4 \times 10^4$ nm). Kaneko teaches that with the structure of Figure 42B, viewing angle is improved over conventional art (Column 17, Lines 57-60).

According to Applicant's enabling disclosure, the thickness of the insulation film is directly related to the voltage ratio. According to Applicant's enabling disclosure, "[t]he 400 nm (of the insulation film thickness) ... corresponds to a 0.9:1.0 voltage ratio and it is preferable that the above mentioned voltage ratio be greater than this." (Specification at page 31). Furthermore, Applicant's enabling disclosure states "... sufficient viewing angle improvement effects can be attained when this thickness is greater than about 800 nm." (Specification at page 30).

Kaneko is therefore evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to optimize and to maximize an insulation film thickness (= voltage ratio) between pixel electrodes for the purpose of improving upon viewing angle as taught in Kaneko.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Michibayashi in view of Kaneko for improving upon viewing angle.

As to claim 11, with reference to Figure 42B, Kaneko illustrates first pixel electrode (94) and second pixel electrode (96) separated by a gate insulation film (98). The gate insulation film has a thickness of 4,000 Angstroms ($=4 \times 10^4$ nm) (Applicant's "wherein the thickness of said insulating layer is 500 nm or greater.").

As to claim 12, the pixel electrode is a transparent electrode (Col. 5, Lines 38-53).

As to claims 16 and 17, the method steps of manufacturing the liquid crystal display devices as claimed by Applicant would have been rendered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made in light of the devices as taught and disclosed by Michibayashi in view of Kaneko.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,680,190 (to Michibayashi et al.) in view of United States Patent 5,777,700 (to Kaneko et al.) and further in view of United States Patent 6,198,516 B1 (to Kim et al.).

As to claim 2, Michibayashi does not appear to explicitly specify a cumulative capacitance for stabilizing the pixel potential during the holding period formed between the

Art Unit: 2871

second pixel electrode and a storage capacitance electrode line or between the second pixel electrode and the preceding gate line adjacent thereto.

Kim teaches and discloses an LCD having a TFT formed at an intersection of data and capacitor lines (Title, entire patent). Kim has storage capacitance obtained between the storage line and the first pixel electrode and between the gate line and the second pixel electrode (Col. 3, Lines 34-38) so that parasitic capacitance is reduced thereby reducing signal delay and thus fast operation of the LCD device is possible (Col. 3, Lines 39-47).

Kim is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to include the structure of a storage capacitance obtained between the storage line and the first pixel electrode and between the gate line and the second pixel electrode for reduced parasitic capacitance, reduced signal delay, and fast operation of an LCD device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Michibayashi in view of Kim to reduce parasitic capacitance thereby reducing signal delay and thus fast operation of the LCD device is possible (Col. 3, Lines 39-47).

As to claim 3, Michibayashi does not appear to explicitly specify that the first pixel electrode is in the same layer as the gate line.

Kim has a first pixel electrode in the same layer as a gate line (Figure 3) for connecting the pixel electrode with the gate electrode, manufacturing ease and efficiency, and reduced process steps.

Kim is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to form a pixel electrode in a same layer as a gate line for connecting the pixel electrode with the gate electrode, manufacturing ease and efficiency, and reduced process steps.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Michibayashi in view of Kim for connecting the pixel electrode with the gate electrode, manufacturing ease and efficiency, and reduced process steps.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 5,680,190 (to Michibayashi et al.) in view of United States Patent 5,777,700 (to Kaneko et al.) and further in view of United States Patent 6,215,542 B1 (to Lee et al.).

As to claim 8, Michibayashi does not appear to explicitly specify a second pixel electrode with an opening through which an insulating film and liquid crystal are held between the first pixel electrode and opposite electrode in that opening.

Lee teaches and discloses a liquid crystal display with improved viewing angle and transmittance (Title, entire patent). With reference to Figures 4A and 4B, Lee illustrates a pixel electrode (33) with a slit (S2) in the center of the pixel (33). A counter electrode (22) opposes the pixel electrode (33) with slit (S2). Liquid crystal (27) is held between the pixel electrode and counter electrode. Such a structure results in an increased viewing angle (Col. 2, Lines 40-50).

Lee is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to include a second

Art Unit: 2871

pixel electrode with an opening through which an insulating film and liquid crystal are held between the first pixel electrode and opposite electrode in that opening for increased viewing angle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Michibayashi in view of Lee for increased viewing angle.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeanne A. Di Grazio whose telephone number is (571)272-2289. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim, can be reached on (571)272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeanne Andrea Di Grazio
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2871

JDG


TARIFUR R. CHOWDHURY
PRIMARY EXAMINER